

## **Storm Water Fee Taskforce - - September 15, 2014**

### **Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:** CCC: Dave Meyer, Gary Schaeffer, Virginia van Breemen, Rob McKinney,  
County Staff: Earl Rowell

**Scope-** identify key data gaps in supporting storm water fee adjustment, and provide County BES with recommendations for resolving gaps

**Gaps** - Limitations in gaps may be attributable to parameters in the MS4 NPDES permit (education, monitoring, capital construction, enforcement and administration. Further the permit required collection of data in the following areas- high density, low density, and commercial.

Data collected by county during ten year periods affirms that a majority of key water quality parameters that are indicative of stream and biological health is available to supplement original 1999 storm water evaluation. Target parameters included suspended solids, nutrients and bacteria.

#### **Identified gaps-**

- Solid waste debris
- Confirmation that water quality data (parameters and sampling locations) are representative of - percentage of land uses in county and
  - watershed distribution

XX

## **Storm Water Fee Taskforce --September 29, 2014-**

### **Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:** CCC: Dave Meyer, Gary Schaeffer, Virginia van Breemen  
County Staff: Earl Rowell

Team met to review draft process flow and refine recommendations to be made to the CCC on October 1, 2014

Overall Objective of this task force is three fold:

1. Assure that County continues to comply with regulations
2. Support County objectives to satisfy the County Clean Water fund deficit
3. Provide input to improve the methods and approaches to accurately quantify water quality equitably to support development of an equitable stormwater fee.

Future consideration: address the following “big picture” questions:

1. Reconcile how the fee structure aligns with anticipated future growth projections and strategies, and future water supply needs

## Key findings:

1. There are data gaps in how solid waste debris in county drainage and waterways is currently quantified
2. The breadth and depth of water quality data collected in the County met the minimum requirements under the permit; however it's recognized that additional data would be highly supportive in establishing an equitable and defensible fee strategy.
3. It's recognized that additional data collection may be expensive and potentially time consuming- therefore it's recommended that the DES identify options to obtain existing and new additional data through outreach to other Clark County jurisdictions and appropriate special services, educational institutions and state agencies.

The suggested process flow describes an overview of steps that should be considered to address the identified gaps and to support the County objectives.

